REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection – Hsu

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-23, 27-28 and 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,288,896 issued to Hsu (hereinafter "Hsu"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Hsu.

Claim 22 pertains to a display comprising:

"*a lamp to illuminate the display; and*

*a heat pipe including a liquid capable of vaporizing coupled to the lamp to transfer heat from a heat generating component of a system to the lamp in the display, **wherein the heat pipe is coupled to a first end of the lamp and a second end of the lamp, the heat pipe to apply heat to both the first and second ends of the lamp***".

Hsu does not teach or suggest these limitations. In particular, Hsu does not teach or suggest that the heat pipe is coupled to **a first end of the lamp** and **a second end of the lamp**, or that the heat pipe is to apply heat to **both** the first and second ends of the lamp. Applicants previously submitted a definition of "end" from Webster's II New College Dictionary with the last response that defined an end as "*either **extremity** of an object having length*". This is the definition of end that is consistent with the specification and one reading the specification and examining Figures 1 and 2 would clearly understand that this is the meaning of end that was intended in the specification. The Examiner has picked a definition that is clearly contrary to the use and meaning of the term "end" as used in the specification. **Accordingly, Applicants hereby state for the record, that "end" means "*either extremity of an object having length*". Furthermore, Applicants have carefully reviewed Hsu and it absolutely does not teach or suggest wherein**

the heat pipe is coupled to a first end of the lamp and a second end of the lamp, the heat pipe to apply heat to both the first and second ends of the lamp.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 requires every element of the claimed invention be identically shown in a single prior art reference. The Federal Circuit has indicated that the standard for measuring lack of novelty by anticipation is **strict identity**. "*For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.*" In Re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For at least these reasons, claim 22 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Hsu.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection – Woo

The Examiner has rejected claims 29-35 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,145,560 issued to Woo (hereinafter "Woo"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Woo.

Claim 29 pertains to a system comprising:

"*a display and a lamp to illuminate the display;*
at least one heat generating component;
a transfer unit to transfer heat from the heat generating component to the lamp; and
a unit to control a level of heat provided to the lamp based on a measurement of electrical input power provided to the lamp in order to maintain a particular level of brightness generated by the lamp".

Woo does not teach or suggest these limitations. In particular, Woo does not teach or suggest a unit to control a level of **heat** provided to the lamp **based on a measurement of electrical input power provided to the lamp** in order to maintain a **particular level of brightness** generated by the lamp.

Woo discusses a sensing step and a causing step. See e.g., the Abstract. The sensing step includes sensing a temperature of a peripheral device (i.e., a liquid crystal display). The causing step includes causing **power** to be provided to the peripheral device **according to the sensed temperature**. As shown in Fig. 3 of Woo, especially at blocks 307, 310, and 312, voltage and current are controlled based on the sensed temperature. Accordingly, Woo discusses controlling **power** based on **temperature**, but does not teach or suggest controlling a level of **heat** provided to the lamp to maintain a level of **brightness** generated by the lamp. Woo absolutely does not teach or suggest controlling the amount of heat provided to the lamp, let alone controlling the level of heat provided to the lamp **based on a measurement of electrical input power provided to the lamp** in order to maintain a **particular level of brightness** generated by the lamp.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 requires every element of the claimed invention be identically shown in a single prior art reference. The Federal Circuit has indicated that the standard for measuring lack of novelty by anticipation is **strict identity**. "*For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.*" In Re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For at least these reasons, claim 29 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Woo.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Hsu and Woo

The Examiner has rejected claims 24-26, 36, 40-44, 47 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu in view of Woo. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Hsu and Woo.

Claim 36 pertains to an apparatus comprising:

"*at least one heat generating component;*

a transfer unit to transfer heat from the at least one heat generating component to a lamp of a display, wherein the transfer unit comprises a heat pipe including a liquid capable of vaporizing proximate the lamp, and wherein the transfer unit comprises a fan or synthetic jet unit ***that is located in the display*** *to generate air movement across* ***the heat pipe having the liquid that is capable of vaporizing*** *and have the heated air flow against the lamp".*

Hsu and Woo do not teach or suggest these limitations. In particular, Hsu and Woo do not teach or suggest a fan or synthetic jet unit **that is located in the display** to generate air movement across **the heat pipe having the liquid that is capable of vaporizing** and have the heated air flow against the lamp.

The Examiner appears to have asserted that Woo discloses a fan [120] to generate air movement across the heat pipe [130] and have the heated air flow against the lamp [150]. However, **component [130] is not a heat pipe, but rather a duct [130]**. See e.g., paragraph [0019]. It is inappropriate to consider the duct [130] a heat pipe, since heat pipes are devices well known in the art as exemplified at least by Hsu. Furthermore, the duct 130 does not have a **liquid that is capable of vaporizing**. Furthermore, Applicants have carefully reviewed Woo and have determined that **Woo does not even mention the words "heat pipe"**. Furthermore, the fan in Woo is not **located in the display**. Accordingly, Woo absolutely does not teach or suggest a fan or synthetic jet unit **that is located in the display** to generate air movement across **the heat pipe having the liquid that is capable of vaporizing** and have the heated air flow against the lamp. Furthermore, **Hsu teaches away from using fans**. See e.g., column 1, line 37; column 2, lines 3-5; and column 9, line 21.

Accordingly, it is simply inappropriate to conclude that Hsu and Woo teach or suggest a fan or synthetic jet unit to generate air movement across the heat pipe.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness set forth in MPEP Section 706.02(j). Specifically, the Examiner has failed to show that "*[t]he teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination ... [is] found*

in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure", as required by In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

For at least these reasons, claim 36 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable over Hsu and Woo.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: By Brent E. Vecchia

Brent E. Vecchia, Reg. No. 48,011
Tel.: (303) 740-1980 (Mountain Time)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025